

Gary M. Hoffman (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Kenneth W. Brothers (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
**DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN**  
**& OSHINSKY, LLP**  
2101 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1526  
Phone (202) 785-9700  
Fax (202) 887-0689

Edward A. Meilman (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN  
& OSHINSKY, LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
Phone (212) 835-1400  
Fax (212) 997-9880

Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715  
Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008  
**ALTSHULER, BERZON, NUSSBAUM, RUBIN & DEMAIN**  
177 Post Street, Suite 300  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Phone (415) 421-7151  
Fax (415) 362-8064

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,  
Defendants.

) CASE NO. CV 03-4669-MJJ (EMC)  
) DISCOVERY MOTION  
) RICOH'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
) MOTION TO COMPEL AGAINST MATROX  
) DEFENDANTS  
) Date: TBD  
) Time: TBD  
) Courtroom: C

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND RELIEF REQUESTED****TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on a date and time to be determined in Courtroom C of the above-referenced court Ricoh Company, Ltd. (“Ricoh”), will and hereby does move the Court for an order compelling Defendants Matrox Graphics, Inc., Matrox Electronic Systems, Inc., Matrox Tech Inc. and Matrox International, Inc (collectively “Matrox”) either to produce documents required by this Court’s May 8, 2006 Order, or for the imposition of a stipulation or similar evidentiary sanctions that were sought in Ricoh’s motion to show cause, which led to the May 8 Order. Although discovery has closed, because it arises from the May 8 Order and depositions taken in the past two weeks, counsel for Matrox has agreed that this motion is timely if filed by June 16, 1006.

Ricoh bases this motion upon the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the supporting declaration of Michael Weinstein and attached exhibits, all pleadings on file in this case, and such argument as may be heard by this Court.

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

On February 21, 2006, Ricoh filed a motion for sanctions seeking, among other things, evidentiary sanctions based upon defendants’ refusal to comply with Judge Jenkins’ July 2005 directives for defendants to disclose relevant information regarding the ASICs at issue. That motion led to the Court’s Order of May 8, 2006, which among other things obligated Matrox to supplement its declarations identifying all of the accused ASICs, as well as produce technical and financial documents: D.I. 460 at 1-4 (“The ‘product package’ for a newly identified Commercial ASIC will include, to the extent that it exists and is within the producing Defendant’s possession, custody or control, the (1) script(s), including DC setup files, (2) inputs, including RTL inputs, (3) technology library(ies), (4) log file(s) and (5) netlist(s) for the newly identified Commercial ASIC.”).

1 On May 10, 2006, Matrox provided supplemental declarations that disclosed, for the first  
 2 time since the bulk of producing product packages began<sup>1</sup>, a new ASIC code named “Maven.”  
 3 Although Matrox was obligated to provide the specified technical and financial documents by no later  
 4 than May 15, it did not. Instead, on June 7, Matrox’s counsel stated that Matrox could not locate any of  
 5 the relevant product level documents. Weinstein Dec., Ex. 2, Chiappini Tr. at 60. The ‘product  
 6 package’ documents are necessary for Ricoh’s expert to analyze the accused ASIC and document its  
 7 infringement claims. Weinstein Dec. ¶ 11.

8 On June 7, 2006, Ricoh’s counsel deposed David Chiappini pursuant to Rule 30(b)(6) with  
 9 respect to Matrox’s newly disclosed products. That designee testified that he was unable to identify the  
 10 most basic technical facts with respect to the Maven chip. Mr. Chiappini had no personal involvement  
 11 with the design or creation of the Maven chip. Based on production specification, Typhoon  
 12 Technologies, another Matrox entities, designed and created, the Maven chip. He was also unable to  
 13 explain why Matrox was unable to locate the relevant technical documents other than to indicate that  
 14 “the design was done a very long time ago, and the company was very young at that point, and  
 15 document retention wasn’t the primary objective.” Weinstein Dec., Ex. 2, Chiappini Tr. at 8).<sup>2</sup>

16 In the past few weeks, Ricoh’s counsel has repeatedly met and conferred with respect to this  
 17 issue, but without success. The parties has previously stipulated that motions with respect to the newly  
 18

---

21  
 22 <sup>1</sup> Maven was previously listed as a declared product as part of a first list of declared products. Weinstein Dec., Ex. 3. Maven  
 23 was subsequently removed from the first declared product list in the second declared product list. Weinstein Dec., Ex. 4.  
 24 The defendants beginning producing Product packages for ASIC products after the service of the second declared product  
 25 list. The ASIC Maven was inserted as a relevant ASIC in the third product list, provided three weeks before the close of  
 26 discovery. Weinstein Dec., Ex. 5. To date, Ricoh has not received the required and requested technical information.  
 27 Weinstein Dec. ¶12.

28 <sup>2</sup> This is not the only ASIC for which Matrox has failed to produce the relevant information. Matrox has failed to produce  
 29 the required technical information for another Matrox chip with the code name of “Rainbow Runner”, which is included on  
 30 the list of declared products. Weinstein Dec., Ex. 6 Ricoh has been advised by Matrox’s counsel that it was continuing to  
 31 look for the technical information for this chip. Subsequently, Matrox’s counsel indicated that there was no data. Weinstein  
 32 Dec. Ex. 7. To date, Ricoh has not received the required and requested technical information. Weinstein Dec. ¶13. Ricoh  
 33 requests that the same relief requested for Maven also be applied with respect to Rainbow Runner.

1 disclosed chips and depositions need be filed by June 15; earlier this week, the parties agreed to extend  
2 this by one day to June 16. Weinstein Dec. ¶14. Although the parties continue to discuss a possible  
3 compromise (discussed below), on June 15, 2006, Matrox's counsel said that Ricoh would be required to  
4 file a motion by June 16 in order to prevent a waiver of Ricoh's right to raise the issue with the Court.  
5

6 Ricoh has no desire to conduct a detailed investigation into when the relevant documents  
7 were destroyed, and whether Matrox failed to take adequate steps to preserve these files during the  
8 pendency of this litigation. Instead, Ricoh proposed a common-sense solution to the problem: Because  
9 Ricoh's infringement theory is similar for the accused Matrox chips, varying only by the nature of the  
10 inputs and the libraries, the parties would stipulate that Ricoh's infringement theory against Matrox  
11 would proceed in the absence of the missing technical information for the Raven and Rainbow Runner  
12 ASICs. There is no dispute between the parties that if Ricoh's infringement theory is accepted by the  
13 jury, all of the accused Matrox chips will be deemed infringing. In that event, the jury would be advised  
14 to include the two chips in the damages calculation. Matrox would not lose its ability to present any of  
15 its defenses, and the evidence would largely be the same. Although Matrox's counsel agreed to consider  
16 this proposal, it also advised Ricoh that Ricoh should nonetheless file this motion to preserve its rights.  
17 If a litigant knows or should have known that it failed to comply with a discovery order, it may be found  
18 at fault for failure to comply with the order. *Wright v. Maritime Overseas Corp.*, 96 F.R.D. 686, 687-  
19 688 (9th Cir. 1983) (dismissing action with prejudice because, “[d]espite proper and lawful demand,  
20 plaintiff has refused to produce any verified discovery responses whatsoever.”). A knowing and willing  
21 violation of a discovery order merits a finding of bad faith against the violating litigant. *Hyde & Drath*  
22 *v. Baker*, 24 F.3d 1162, 1168 (9th Cir. 1994) (“We need not consider whether the district court abused  
23 its discretion in failing to consider the doctors' declarations before it dismissed the complaint because  
24 there is alternative evidence of K'ung's bad faith regarding the discovery orders.”). “The choice of the  
25 appropriate discovery sanction is the responsibility of the trial judge and will not be reversed absent  
26 abuse of discretion.” *Wright*, 96 F.R.D. at 687-688. The sanction sought by Ricoh is less severe than  
27 abuse of discretion.” *Wright*, 96 F.R.D. at 687-688. The sanction sought by Ricoh is less severe than  
28

1 those sanctions authorized by Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2), which include taking designated facts as  
 2 established, prohibiting a party from introducing evidence, striking pleadings and default judgment.

3 Ricoh's proposal is fair and equitable. It avoids a protracted battle over when and why  
 4 highly relevant evidence was lost or destroyed. It does not materially lighten Ricoh's obligation to  
 5 prove infringement, nor does it unfairly prejudice Matrox. The proposed solution is far less draconian  
 6 than Ricoh's original relief sought in its motion to show cause, and is within the discretion of this Court.  
 7

8 A proposed Order is attached.  
 9  
 10

11 Dated: June 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

12 Ricoh Company, Ltd.

13 Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715  
 14 Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008  
 15 Altshuler, Berzon, Nussbaum, Rubin &  
 16 Demain  
 17 177 Post Street, Suite 300  
 18 San Francisco, California 94108  
 19 Phone: (415) 421-7151  
 20 Fax: (415) 362-8064

By: /s/ Gary M. Hoffman

Gary M. Hoffman  
 Kenneth W Brothers  
 Michael A. Weinstein  
 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
 OSHINSKY LLP  
 2101 L Street NW  
 Washington, D.C. 20037-1526  
 Telephone: (202) 785-9700  
 Facsimile: (202) 887-0689

Edward A. Meilman  
 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
 OSHINSKY LLP  
 1177 Avenue of the Americas  
 New York, New York 10036  
 Telephone: (212) 896-5471  
 Facsimile: (212) 997-9880

25 Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

RICOH COMPANY, LTD., ) Case No. CV-03-4669-MJJ  
Plaintiff, )  
[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
PLAINTIFF RICOH'S MOTION  
TO COMPEL AGAINST MATROX  
DEFENDANTS  
v. )  
AEROFLEX ET AL., )  
Defendants. )

Upon consideration of RICOH'S MOTION TO COMPEL AGAINST MATROX DEFENDANTS, and supporting evidence, Defendants' Opposition, and supporting evidence, and any reply and additional argument, and having conducted a hearing on the motions, and the Court being fully advised of the premises, the Court hereby GRANTS Ricoh's Motion to Compel against Matrox Defendants.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED:

---

The Honorable Edward Chen  
Magistrate Judge, United States District Court